



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the appointment of receivers for its property by the federal circuit court. Then the attorney-general of New York, in the course of a suit to dissolve the corporation pursuant to statute, because of its insolvency for a year, moved for the appointment of receivers for its property. A statute permits the appointment in a dissolution suit. *Held*, that receivers will be appointed, but they are to request the federal court to relinquish control, and are not to molest the federal receivers. *People v. N. Y. City Ry.*, 107 N. Y. Supp. 247 (Sup. Ct.). See NOTES, p. 279.

SALES — IMPLIED WARRANTIES — OBLIGATIONS OF VENDOR OF STOCK. — The appellant purchased from the appellee shares in a certain mining corporation. The corporation proved to be a *de facto* one, and the shares part of an illegal over-issue. The appellant sought to rescind the sale. *Held*, that the sale is valid, since the vendor of stock impliedly warrants only his title to the stock and its genuineness. *Burwash v. Ballou*, 82 N. E. 355 (Ill.).

The vendor of stock impliedly warrants his ownership in the stock certificate, that it is genuine, and that he is authorized to transfer the title thereto. If the vendee desires further protection, he must ordinarily exact an express warranty. *Higgins v. Ill. Trust and Savings Bank*, 193 Ill. 394. Since the vendor and vendee are presumably on an equal footing, there seems to be no element of unfairness which demands the implication of further warranty that the stock sold is stock of a *de jure* corporation. *Harter v. Eltzroth*, 111 Ind. 159. Where there is a contract for the sale of bonds of which there is only an unauthorized issue outstanding, delivery of bonds of such issue is sufficient. *Otis v. Cullum*, 92 U. S. 447. Where, however, there are both authorized and unauthorized issues, delivery of bonds of the illegal issue, though in good faith, is not a sufficient compliance with the terms of the contract, since it is presumed that the vendee contracted for bonds of the valid issue. *Meyer v. Richards*, 163 U. S. 385. The same rule would seem to apply to issues of stock, though the present case fails to notice the distinction. *Cf. Lincoln v. Express Co.*, 45 La. Ann. 729; *contra, People's Bank v. Kurtz*, 99 Pa. St. 344.

STATES — VALIDITY OF STATE BOND STOLEN AFTER REDEMPTION BEFORE MATURITY. — A statute authorized an issue of negotiable state bonds, redeemable before maturity, and provided that all bonds redeemed should be destroyed. A bond which had been redeemed, but not cancelled or destroyed, was stolen and came into the possession of the relator, a holder in due course. *Held*, that *mandamus* lies to compel the state treasurer to redeem the bond again. *Ehrlich v. Jennings*, 58 S. E. 922 (S. C.). See NOTES, p. 282.

STATUTES — INTERPRETATION — REQUIREMENT OF KNOWLEDGE IN CONVICTIONS UNDER THE SAFETY APPLIANCE ACT. — Section 2 of the Safety Appliance Act, 27 Stat. at L. 531, makes it unlawful for any common carrier "to haul, permit to be hauled or used on its line any car used in moving interstate traffic" not equipped with workable automatic couplers. In an action thereunder, the government proved defects in the couplers without proving the defendant's knowledge thereof. *Held*, that to sustain a conviction, the evidence must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the carrier either had discovered the defects, or could have discovered them by the exercise of the utmost care. *United States v. Illinois Cent. R. R. Co.*, 156 Fed. 182 (Dist. Ct., W. D. Ky.); *contra, United States v. C., B. & Q. Ry. Co.*, 156 Fed. 180 (Dist. Ct., D. Neb.).

So far as it is necessary to prevent injury to persons or property, the regulation and control of railroads is within the police power of the states. *Jones v. Alabama & Vicksburg Ry. Co.*, 72 Miss. 22. The purpose of the Safety Appliance Act, as set forth in the title, is to promote the safety of employees and travellers. It is analogous to an exercise of state police power. No *mens rea* is required to convict for offenses against police regulations involving no moral turpitude. *Com. v. Wentworth*, 118 Mass. 441. The present case can therefore be supported only by reading into the act a requirement of knowledge. It is settled that though penal laws are to be construed strictly, they are not to be construed so strictly as to defeat the obvious intention of the legislature. See